

## REMARKS

In the May 12, 2008 Office Action, claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11, 12, and 18 were objected to and claims 1-18 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

### *Status of Claims and Amendments*

In response to the May 12, 2008 Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 4 to rewrite it in independent form and cancelled claims 1-3, 8-10, and 18 as indicated above. Also, Applicant has amended claim 13 to distinguish over the prior art and correct errors discovered upon review. Thus, claims 4-7 and 11-17 are pending, with claims 4 and 13 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

### *Claim Objections*

In item 1 of the Office Action, claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11, and 12 were objected to because of informalities. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2 and 9 rendering the objections moot, and rewritten claim 4 in independent form while correcting the informality regarding the recitation of "electric motor," thus obviating the objections of claims 4-7, 11, and 12. Also, claim 18 was objected to as being of improper dependent form. In response, Applicant has cancelled claim 18.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

### *Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gunji, Yoshihiro (JP 2000-227231, hereinafter "Gunji"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

In particular, independent claims 4 and 13 now recite a centrifugal fan that requires:

- *a cover being coupled to said rotary shaft for rotation with said main plate covering said cooling air hole from the side opposite the electric motor, and being provided to rotate integrally with said main plate, and said air guide is formed between said cover and said main plate, and*
- *said air guide being formed between said cover on an electric motor side thereof, and said main plate on the side opposite said electric motor.*

Applicant respectfully asserts that this structure is ***not*** disclosed or suggested by Gunji or any other prior art of record.

More specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action identifies the the rib 14 of Gunji as the cover and the path through 11 as the air hole recited in the claims 4 and 13 of the present application. However, as seen in Figs. 2(A) and 2(B) of Gunji, Applicant respectfully asserts that the cover 14 is arranged beside the air hole and does ***not*** cover the cooling air hole from the side opposite the electric motor (the fan motor 6 of Gunji).

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose ***each*** element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 4 and 13, as now amended, is ***not*** anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that the prior art also fails to anticipate or to suggest the structure of dependent claims 7 and 16, which recite that the air guide is formed in the cover, for the aforementioned reasons and even further for the reasons mentioned below. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action identifies the auxiliary extracting portion 13 as the air guide of Gunji. However, as seen in Fig. 2(B) of Gunji, the air guide 13 of Gunji is not formed in the cover 14. More specifically, Gunji does ***not*** disclose ***an air guide*** being formed between said cover ***on an electric motor side thereof***, and said main plate ***on the side opposite said electric motor***, as claimed in the current amendment.

Regardless, Applicant believes that the dependent claims 5-7, 11, 12, and 14-17 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 4 or 13, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 5-7, 11, 12, and 14-17 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claims 4 or 13, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Appl. No. 10/507,019  
Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2008  
Amendment dated August 12, 2008

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-7 and 11-17 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Yoshiko Sugahara /

Yoshiko Sugahara

Limited Recognition No. L0395

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: August 12, 2008

S:\07-JUL08-YS\DK-US020672 Amendment .doc